

Remarks

In the present response, claim 21 is canceled; and claims 1 and 10 are amended. Claim 22 is newly added. Claims 1-20 and 22 are presented for examination.

No new matter is entered as support for the amendments and new claim appears at least at p. 5, lines 20-23, Technical Field of the Invention, and the Background.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,631,369 (Meyerzon). These rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 and 10 recite one or more elements that are not taught in Meyerzon. Some examples are provided below.

As one example, claim 1 recites searching a lexical search tree data structure to determine whether a received URL is hostile. By contrast, Meyerzon crawls the web to create a document store to determine when documents in the store change, are new, or are deleted (Meyerzon at column 3, lines 1-6). A web crawler creates an index of documents that includes a list of URLs (see Meyerzon at column 3, lines 17-27). Thereafter, a comparison is made of the list of URLs to identify which documents changed. Nowhere does Meyerzon teach that the list of URLs is searched to determine whether a received URL is hostile.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)). For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Meyerzon.

As another example, claim 1 recites detecting an intrusion of said received URL and denying a request to the received URL in response to the receiver URL being hostile. Meyerzon does not teach this element.

As noted, Meyerzon consults the list of URLs to identify which documents changed. Meyerzon does not detect an intrusion. Furthermore, Meyerzon does not deny a request in response to a URL being hostile.

For a prior art reference to anticipate under section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference (see *In re Bond*, 910

F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Meyerzon.

As one example, claim 10 recites a lexical search tree data structure that stores a plurality of hostile URLs. Meyerzon never teaches that the URLs in his list are hostile.

Anticipation is established only when a single prior art reference discloses each and every element of a claimed invention united in the same way (see *RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc.*, 730 F.2d 1440, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). For at least these reasons, claim 10 is not anticipated by Meyerzon.

As another example, claim 10 recites that the filter operates to detect an intrusion of said received URL and deny said processing of said received URL in response to said received URL matching any of said plurality of hostile URLs. By contrast, Meyerzon crawls the web to create a document store to determine when documents in the store change, are new, or are deleted (Meyerzon at column 3, lines 1-6). Meyerzon does not detect an intrusion. Furthermore, Meyerzon does not teach denying the received URL in response to the received URL matching a hostile URL.

There can be no difference between the claimed invention and the cited reference, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the art (see *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). For at least these reasons, claim 10 is not anticipated by Meyerzon.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant sincerely thanks the examiner for indicating allowance of claims 2-9 and 17-21. Applicant makes a sincere effort to place this application in condition for allowance. Applicant encourages the examiner to telephone attorney Philip Lyren (832-326-5529) to discuss the application and expedite allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529